REMARKS

This is a full response to the outstanding Office Action, and is filed with a request and payment for a 3 month extension of time to Respond to the Office Action.

1. Present Status Of The Claims

After entry of the amendments made herein, claims 1-12, 14-27, and 29-30 remain pending in the Application. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, 16, and 24. Dependent claims 10, and 15 have been amended, and claims 13 and 28 have been withdrawn. Additionally, the Applicant herewith submits remarks specifically responding to the rejections in the pending Office Action. It is believed that no new matter has been added to the Application.

2. Summary Of The Rejections

The Office Action contains a rejection of claims 10, 13, 25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The pending Office Action further contains a rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 16-19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and a rejection of claims 5, 8, 9-15, 20 and 23-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Response To Rejections Of Claims 10, 13, 25 and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Dependent claims 10, 13, 25 and 28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, with respect to claims 13 and 28, the Office Action states that use of the trademark/trade name Quicktime in the claim does not comply with the requirements of claims 35 U.S.C. §112, and that claims 10 and 25 recite the phrase "said first encoder/decoder box" although what is meant is the "said second encoder/decoder box."

In response to this rejection, the Applicants have withdrawn claims 13 and 28, and amended claims 10 and 25 to state "said second encoder/decoder box" where applicable.

Thus, Applicants believe that these amendments overcome the rejection over under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and the Applicants assert that the rejection of dependent claims 10, 13, 25 and 28 has been traversed.

4. Response To Rejection Of Claims 1-4, 6-7, 16-19, 21 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 16-19, 21 and 22 are rejected in the Office Action as being anticipated by P. Galvez, H. Newman, C. Isnard and G. Denis, "Networking, Videoconferencing and Collaborative Environments", Sept. 29, 1998 (*Galvez*). The Applicant traverses the rejections to claims 1-4, 6-7, 16-19, 21 and 22.

For brevity, and because the Applicants' arguments against the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 16-19, 21 and 22 over *Galvez* are equally applicable for all of these claims, the Applicants use independent claims 1 and 16 as illustrative of the response for all of the currently-pending claims 1-4, 6-7, 16-19, 21 and 22.

Independent claims 1 and 16 have each been amended to state an element of "resynchronizing the videoconferencing packets if a number of lost packets exceeds a threshold." This amendment is supported in the specification at page 17, lines 12-20, and Fig. 8. Thus, the applicants submit that no new matter is added by this amendment.

The Applicants further submit that the element of "resynchronizing the videoconferencing packets if a number of lost packets exceeds threshold," in combination with the other claim elements, is not taught, or suggested, by any of the cited references, alone or in combination. Thus, the Applicants believe that the amendments to claims 1 and 16 overcome the rejection over *Galvez*, and the Applicants assert that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 16 have been traversed, and amended claims 1 and 16 are in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 2-4, 6-7, 17-19, 21 and 22 depend from claim 1 or 16, and therefore, those claims are in condition for allowance as well.

5. Response To Rejections Of Claims 5, 8-12, 14-15, 20, 23-27 and 29-30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Applicant traverses the rejections to claims 5, 8-12, 14-15, 20, 23-27 and 29-30, as discussed below.

a. Claims 5 and 20

Claims 5 and 20 depend from claims 1 and 16 respectively, which, for the reasons discussed above are now in condition for allowance. Thus Applicants submit that claims 5 and 20 are also in condition for allowance.

b. Claims 8 and 23.

Claims 8 and 23 depend from claims 1 and 16 respectively. Thus, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 16, the Applicants submit that claims 8 and 23 are also in condition for allowance.

c. Claims 9-12, 15, 24-27 and 30

Claims 9 and 24 are independent, and are rejected by the Office Action as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over *Galvez* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,590,604 to Tucker (*Tucker*). Claims 10-12, 15, 24-27 and 30 each depend from claims 9 and 24 respectively. For brevity, and because the Applicants' arguments against the rejection of claims 9-12, 15, 24-27 and 30 are equally applicable for all of these claims, the Applicants use independent claims 9 and 24 as illustrative of the response for all of the currently-pending claims 9-12, 15, 24-27 and 30.

Independent claims 9 and 24 have been amended to clarify that the "first encoder/decoder box [is] for encoding and decoding the video conference data for the first and second computing device," and that "the second encoder/decoder box [is] for encoding and decoding the video conference data for the third computing device." This shared decoder box technology allows one decoder box to perform the encoding/decoding process for two or more computing devices. This amendment is supported in the specification in original claims 9 and 24, and on page 16, line 8, through

page 17, line 4, and Fig. 5. Thus, the applicants submit that no new matter is added by this amendment.

The Applicants further submit that the element of providing a shared encoder/decoder box for two or more computing devices, in combination with the other claim elements, is not taught, or suggested, by any of the cited references, alone or in combination. Thus, the amendments to claims 9 and 24 more clearly point out the invention to overcome the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. §103, and the Applicants assert that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 16 have been traversed, and amended claims 9 and 24 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 10-12, 15 and 25-27 depend from claim 9 or 24, and therefore, those claims are in condition for allowance as well.

d. Claims 14 and 29.

Claims 14 and 29 depend from claims 9 and 24 respectively. Thus, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 9 and 24, the Applicants submit that claims 14 and 29 are also in condition for allowance.

e. Claims 15 and 30.

Claims 15 and 30 depend from independent claims 9 and 24 respectively. Thus, for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 9 and 24, the Applicants submit that claims 15 and 30 are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants have made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing discussions, it is clear that the cited art, individually or in combination, does not teach all of the elements of any claim, as amended, of the present invention. Thus, the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-12, 26-27 and 29-30 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8300. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:30 AM to 5:30 PM Pacific Time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 25, 2005

J.D. Harriman
Reg. No. 31,967
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER
& STEINER LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 1200
Los Angeles, California 90067
(310) 712-8300

JDH:IP:Sk